UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,862	08/28/2006	Albert Gezinus Huizing	Vereenigde P65US0	4784
	7590 04/08/200 ing Schmidt & Howlet	EXAMINER		
Bridgewater Place P O Box 352 Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0352			SOTOMAYOR, JOHN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1 /			3662	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/549,862	HUIZING ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John B. Sotomayor	3662				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	_					
·—						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	pante Quayre, 1000 C.2. 11, 10	0 0.0. 2.0.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.	· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
_						
,	·					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 September 2005</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u>. </u>		(1) (7)				
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	3.⊠ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment/c\						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 📈 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>27JUN2006</u> . 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 3662

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings filed September 22, 2005 appear to be informal.

2. The drawings are objected to because the boxes in the figures should be labeled with descriptive legends. Thus the boxes in Figures 1-3 should be labeled. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3662

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed June 27, 2006 has been entered and considered. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 by the Examiner is attached.

Preliminary Amendment

4. The preliminary amendment filed September 22, 2005 has been entered and considered.

Priority

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The foreign priority data should be inserted in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The

claims are considered to be operational or quasi-method in that they recite an intended use without setting forth structure or means that would limit the claims upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 9. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 12, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 10. As stated in the above numbered paragraph 7, it is unclear as to what exactly is being claimed in claims 2-4, 6-9, and 12. What structure or means is being set forth in the claim?
- 11. Claims 3, 4, and 6 should probably include the phrase "further comprising" since it is unclear as to whether the claim is definite and/or provides sufficient or proper limitations for the plurality of time delay elements in the claims upon which they depend.
- 12. Claims 27 and 28 are considered to be confusing since they appear to be written awkwardly. The claims do not conform to accepted US Patent Office claim format for claiming a computer program. It is unclear and confusing as to whether claim 27 and/or

Art Unit: 3662

claim 28 are independent or dependent claims. Correction and/or clarification is

required. What exactly is being claimed in claim 28? What is meant by "A data

carrier..."?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

14. Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or

Sekiguchi ('775).

The claims, as best understood, are considered to be either met by the document

to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) who show a

detection system and method including, inter alia, an optical sensor, a radar device, and

a signal processing for processing signals from the optical and radar device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 10 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775).

The invention is substantially disclosed by the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775).

However it appears that the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) do not show a dish antenna.

It is submitted, and Official notice is taken, that dish antennas are well known in the radar art as a means to transmit signals.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the systems in the document to Daimler Benz (EP '423) or the article to Nelson et al, or Sekiguchi ('775) to include a dish antenna as a well known substitute for an antenna.

Conclusion

- 17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art show various radar systems.
- 18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Sotomayor whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 3662

272-6978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom H. Tarcza, can be reached on 571-272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John B. Sotomayor/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3662